



## Code Discussion Issues

Below is a summary of the more significant code issues that have been brought up by public and/or city council members during the city council study sessions dated July 22, July 29, August 12, and August 26, 2013. While Council consensus has been reached on some issues (such items are not included below), there are a number of issues that warrant further city council discussion and consensus as to direction.

### Article 2 Issues

**Permit Type Process.** Staff asked to make them more understandable.

15.280.050 Landmark commission duties. Council member concern over **Landmarks review of regional retail commercial master plans** and suggestion to use a consultant instead.

- Staff Note: The Commission review results in a recommendation to City Council which could be accepted or amended by Council.

### Article 3 Issues

Table 15.310.040 Use tables, non-residential: **Should Office uses be allowed in CT and IL zones?**

- COUNCIL should provide more clear direction on office uses.

Tables 15.320.030 and .040 and section 15.320.050: **Maximum FAR standards** in some or all zones?

- General discussion, but no consensus.

15.320.070: **Impervious surface area**

- Based on "Impervious Area Standards" memorandum from Jon Morrow, Stormwater Program Manager, staff recommends removing the impervious surface area standards from the draft code.

Table 15.320.030; **Garage front setbacks.** Consensus is to reduce from 25' to 22'

15.380. **Development Agreement Authority.**

- Council directed staff amend language clarifying development agreement versus service agreement and to clarify "and all applicable development regulations"

### Article 4

15.410 **Streetscape Design – NEEDS FURTHER COUNCIL DIRECTION**

#### ISSUES

1. Reduced lane width on local streets
  - Is 20-ft wide street with no parking workable?
  - Is 24-ft wide street with parking on 1-side workable?
  - Is 30-ft wide street with parking both sides adequate travel lane?
2. Increased ROW width or shrink it?
  - a. Can utilities all go in ROW rather than an easement outside sidewalk?
  - b. Can planting strip be reduced in size?
  - c. Can house minimum setback be reduced from 15-feet?



3. Rolled curb/gutter allowed or not?

**15.420 Subdivision Design & Block Structure – NEEDS FURTHER COUNCIL DIRECTION**

15.420.030 **Reverse frontage lot provisions (fences)**. Some Council discussion of limiting the reverse frontage restriction to 50% of the frontage being fenced and other areas screened with trees/landscaping.

15.420.060 **Direct access to a public ROW**. As drafted private roads are only OK in courtyard developments with no more than 5 units accessing from them and a maximum length of 100 feet.

QUESTION: Should private roads be allowed in more situations?

**Article 5**

15.530.020(B) citizen suggestion to edit to make use of Secretary of Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties mandatory since that is what Landmarks and Design Commission uses in its review of alterations to properties on the Landmark Register.

- Council previously directed that the Landmarks Design Standards in 15.280.120 all be moved to this section so that all design standards are in one Article.
- Staff has contacted the State and although there is no requirement to use the Secretary's Standards it is the best practice and is used by virtually all Certified Local Governments in the state.
- STAFF RECOMMENDATION is to include reference in Code to the Secretary's Standards as part of the design standards used to review alterations to Landmark Register properties

15.530 Building Design. Citizen suggested prohibiting **faux architecture**. No Council discussion on issue thus far but staff is to find some example language.

15.530 Building Design. Citizen concerns over **multifamily building articulation** standards, including cost implications and departure provisions. Council discussion on issue, but no consensus. Staff suggested allowing "other treatments" or "other methods" to the list of articulation options for multifamily buildings.

- 15.530.030(D) citizen suggestion to edit the DEPARTURE language to **change "elements" to "criterion"** to assist the DEPARTURE review body. This could be inserted in all DEPARTURE language.
- Council directed staff to add language providing up to a 10% administrative variance option for all dimensional requirements in the design standards. **Should this apply to all dimensional standards in the Code** such as building setbacks from property lines, CAO buffers, etc. **OR just to the Article 5 design dimensional standards?**

15.540 Housing Type Standards. Citizen general concerns re the prescriptive nature of the standards. Some standards still need Council Consensus:

- .020(B)(1) **pedestrian access**
- .020(B)(2) **covered entry**
- .020(B)(3) **minimum façade transparency** **CONSENSUS 10% with 8% on north facing facades** subject to staff research on Energy Code issue
- .020(C)(3) **garage setback** **CONSENSUS 22'**
- .020(D)(2) **driveway width** **CONSENSUS 24**
- .020(E) **minimum useable open space** for single family
- .040(B)(1)(b) **stairway location** **CONSENSUS delete it**



.040(C and D) **Accessory Dwelling Unit minimum sizes** – **CONSENSUS** make Detached ADU same as Attached ADU

**Table 15.540.050 Cottage Housing ground floor square footage**

- Should it be same for ground floor and second story?
- Should the overall size of the unit be lower than 1,200 sq. ft.?

**.050(G) cottage housing façade transparency**

- Similar to single family 10% with 8% on north façade?

**15.550.030 Required off-street parking spaces for apartments.** Citizen concern about standards. Council accepted Staff's suggested revisions on bicycle parking:

- hotel/motel from 1 per guest room to 1 per 20 guest rooms
- office/retail from 1 per 1000sf to 1 per 5000sf up to 50,000sf building then 1 per 10,000sf beyond 50,000sf

**15.560 Signs** Council took citizen comments and had minimal discussion but reached **NO CONSENSUS**

**.050 Monument signs.** Citizen concerns over standards:

- Corner lots – allow one sign on each frontage
- Signs are too big.
- Signs are too small and landscaping blocks signs.

**.060 Pole signs.** Citizen wants pole signs allowed in more zones than CT and in areas more than ½ mile from freeway.

**.070 Wall signs.** Citizen concerns over standards:

- Concern over (A)(1) – not enough signage allowed, too confusing
- Concerns that signs and lettering are too large

**.150 Electronic signs.** Citizen concerns over standards: Commercial zone electronic signs should be just as large as what's allowed in P-R zone.

**.170 Non-conforming signs.** Citizen concerns over subsection B, regarding legal non-conforming signs and eligibility to install new signs.

**.180 Feather signs.** **NEW** Staff presentation on feather sign considerations. Staff to provide some language for Council discussion.

**.180 Temporary signs.** Citizen suggestion – add stronger enforcement language regarding temporary signs.

**15.570.040 Landscaping Types.** Council directed staff to coordinate with local native plant society on provisions more suited to Ellensburg's dry climate (updating landscaping type provisions and promoting xeriscape)

**15.580.020 Outdoor Lighting - Applicability** – residential development. Citizen concern about standards.

## **ARTICLE 6 Critical Areas**

Citizen concern regarding use of term "Frequently Flooded Areas" in the code. Staff directed to determine if wording is mandatory or can it be changed to something else like "100-Year Floodplain"